1 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

BRIAN ALFORD,

Petitioner,

VS.

D.W. NEVEN, et al.,

Respondents.

Case No. 2:14-cv-00333-APG-NJK

ORDER

This habeas corpus action comes before the court on respondents' motion to dismiss (Dkt. #16) as well as petitioner's motion for leave to file a second amended petition (Dkt. #s 20 & 21).¹

In their motion to dismiss, respondents argue that, of the five grounds, two are either noncognizable in federal habeas corpus or are unexhausted (Dkt.#16, pp. 4-5). Petitioner, through counsel, filed a response to the motion to dismiss and a request to file a second amended petition (Dkt.#21). Petitioner now acknowledges that it was ill-advised to bring ground 5(B)—related to the state district court's alleged abuse of discretion in not addressing jury questions—as a substantive subpart to ground 5. Petitioner, therefore, requests permission to file a second amended petition "which would transmute the jury note incident from a substantive claim into a fact in support of the felony murder jury

¹ Petitioner filed one document styled a response to respondents' motion to dismiss and request to file a second amended petition, which was docketed as two separate motions (Dkt. #s 20 & 21). The court shall cite to the document as Dkt. #21.

instruction [claim] found in ground 2(A) and the sufficiency of the evidence claim found in ground 4" of the first amended petition (Dkt. #21, p. 3).

Respondents replied and state that they do not oppose petitioner filing a second amended petition (Dkt. #27, p. 3). They note that they do not waive any defense to a newly-filed petition, including exhaustion. *Id.* at 3-4. Good cause appearing, the court shall grant petitioner leave to file a second amended petition, and therefore, the motion to dismiss shall be denied without prejudice.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that respondents' motion to dismiss (Dkt. #16) is **DENIED** without prejudice.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner's motion to file a second amended petition (Dkt. #21) is GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner, through counsel, shall have thirty (30) days from the date of this order to file and serve his second amended petition.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondents shall have thirty (30) days following service of the second amended petition within which to answer, or otherwise respond to, the second amended petition. Any response filed shall comply with the provisions set forth in this court's order dated April 4, 2014 (Dkt. #7, pp. 2-3).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner shall have thirty (30) days following service of the answer, motion to dismiss, or other response to file a reply or opposition, with any other requests for relief by respondents by motion otherwise being subject to the normal briefing schedule under the local rules.

Dated this 6th day of May, 2015.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE